

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11-42 and 44 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends the Claims 11, 19, 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44 and cancels Claims 1-10 and 43.

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Claim 9 has been canceled. Claim 19 has been amended to recite the feature of "an obstacle arranged to limit a density of electronic chip components near the cavities of the accommodating device to a predetermined value," which Applicant's submit clearly and definitely describes the obstacle. Support for this feature is found for example, in the third full paragraph on page 18 and Fig. 20 (obstacle 65) of the originally filed application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13, 14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-31, 33, 34, 36-40, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. (U.S. 6,019,564) in view of Jin et al. (U.S. 6,121,118). Claims 15, 25, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. Claims 2, 12, 22, 32, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Jin et al., and further in view of Saito et al. (JP 63-295323). Applicant notes that although the Examiner indicated that claims 15, 25, and 35 were rejected over Kiyokawa et al. alone, it appears that the Examiner intended to reject claims 15, 25, and 35 over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Jin because claims 15, 25, and 35 are dependent upon claims 11, 21, and 31, respectively, which were rejected over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Jin et al. Claims 1-10 and 43 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 11-42 and 44.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite:

A handling device for electronic chip components, comprising:
an accommodating device having a plurality of cavities
arranged to put electronic chip components thereinto; and

a feeder arranged to supply the electronic chip components to the accommodating device; wherein
the feeder includes a transport surface arranged to transport the electronic chip components towards the plurality of cavities, and a feeding section arranged to feed the electronic components into the plurality of cavities;
the accommodating device is arranged to move such that at least one of the cavities is successively disposed at a location which is in close proximity to the feeding section of the feeder;
on the transport surface of the feeder, **the electronic chip components are supported on only one side surface thereof, without fixing an orientation of a length direction of the electronic chip components;**
the electronic chip components are put directly into the cavities from the feeding section of the feeder by providing suction in the cavities from a cavity side;
the feeder includes a sidewall at a peripheral edge of the transport surface;
the sidewall includes an opening portion; and
the opening portion in the sidewall is blocked by a cavity formation surface in which the cavities of the accommodating device are provided. (emphasis added)

Applicant's Claims 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44 recite features that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 11, including the above-emphasized features.

The Examiner alleged that the combination of Kiyokawa et al. and Jin et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' Claims 11, 21, 31, and 44 and that the combination of Kiyokawa et al. Jin et al., and Saito et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' Claims 41 and 42. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant's Claim 11 has been amended to recite the features of "the feeder includes a sidewall at a peripheral edge of the transport surface," "the sidewall includes an opening portion," and "the opening portion in the sidewall is blocked by a cavity formation surface in which the cavities of the accommodating device are provided." Applicants' Claims 21, 31, and 41, 42, and 44 have been similarly amended. Support for these features is found, for example, in the second full paragraph on page 7, the last

full paragraph on page 10, the third full paragraph on page 15, the fourth full paragraph on page 17, and Figs. 2-4 the originally filed application.

First, elements 3, 3F, 3R of Kiyokawa et al., which the Examiner alleged correspond to the feeder recited in Applicant's Claims 11, 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44, are disclosed as being a carrier arm 3 and pick-up heads 3F and 3R. The pick-up heads 3F and 3R are further disclosed as being vacuum suction heads which pick up electronic devices (ICs) from tray groups 2 by application of a suction force, and which deposit the ICs in cavities 5 by stopping the suction force (see, for example, col. 5, lines 16-50 of Kiyokawa et al.). In addition, as clearly seen in Fig. 1 of Kiyokawa et al., the ICs are precisely arranged in a matrix such that the orientation of the ICs which are picked up by the pick-up heads 3F and 3R is precisely the same each and every time. In other words, the length direction of the ICs in Kiyokawa et al. is **fixed in a very specific orientation**. Thus, the ICs of Kiyokawa et al. certainly cannot be fairly construed as being supported on one surface of the feeder **without fixing the orientation of the length direction** thereof. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Kiyokawa et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the electronic chip components are supported on only one side surface thereof, without fixing an orientation of a length direction of the electronic chip components" as recited in Applicant's Claim 11, and similarly in Applicant's Claims 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44.

Second, the feeder 3, 3F, and 3R of Kiyokawa et al. does not include any sidewalls, and thus cannot possibly include an opening in a sidewall. Thus, Kiyokawa et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "the feeder includes a sidewall at a peripheral edge of the transport surface," "the sidewall includes an opening portion," and "the opening portion in the sidewall is blocked by a cavity formation surface in which the cavities of the accommodating device are provided" as recited in Applicant's Claim 11, and similarly in Applicant's Claims 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44. Furthermore, there would have been absolutely no reason to provide a sidewall in the feeder of Kiyokawa et al., since the pick-up heads 3F and 3R of Kiyokawa et al. securely hold the ICs in

position and deposit the ICs in the cavities 5. Thus, a sidewall would have been completely useless and unnecessary in the feeder 3, 3F and 3R of Kiyokawa et al.

The Examiner relied upon Jin et al. and Saito et al. to allegedly cure various deficiencies of Kiyokawa et al. However, neither Jin et al. nor Saito et al. teaches or suggests the features of “the feeder includes a sidewall at a peripheral edge of the transport surface,” “the sidewall includes an opening portion,” and “the opening portion in the sidewall is blocked by a cavity formation surface in which the cavities of the accommodating device are provided” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 11, and similarly in Applicant’s Claims 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kiyokawa et al., Jin et al., and Saito et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination of features recited in Applicant’s Claims 11, 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 11, 21, 31, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Jin et al., and the rejection of Claims 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokawa et al. in view of Jin et al., and further in view of Saito et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11, 21, 31, 41, 42, and 44 are allowable. Claims 12-20, 22-30, and 32-40 depend upon Claims 11, 21, and 31, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 11, 21, and 31 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a Two-Month Extension of Time, extending to October 1, 2007 (September 30, 2007 falls on a Sunday), the period for response to the Office Action dated April 30, 2007.

Application No. 10/809,679
September 25, 2007
Reply to the Office Action dated April 30, 2007
Page 17 of 17

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 25, 2007

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710